

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/230,463	07/26/99	WYNICK	D 23016.0002

DAVID G. PERRYMAN
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG
THE CANDLER BUILDING
127 PEACHTREE STREET NE SUITE 1200
ATLANTA GA 30303-1811

HM22/0829

EXAMINER

GUCKER, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

DATE MAILED: 08/29/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/230,463

Applicant(s)

Wynick

Examiner

Stephen Buckle

Group Art Unit

1647

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/26/00
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 2, 3, 5, & 7-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, & 6 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 6
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Serial Number: 09/230,463

2

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1647.
2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1, 4, and 6 with traverse, in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no serious search burden exists between Groups I-II (claims 1-6). This is not found persuasive because the elected invention is drawn to methods for producing a composition (a medicament) and the intended use of the composition does not provide a patentable distinction over any other composition that meets the claim limitations. On the other hand, Group II is drawn to methods of treatment which would require an entirely different and non-overlapping search because enablement issues in addition to claim limitations such as Alzheimer's disease would be given substantial weight as compared to the claims of Group I. As such, different searches are required and different issues would have to be evaluated which would pose an undue burden on the Examiner is therefore made FINAL.
3. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7-17 are withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
4. Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 provide for the use of galanin agonists in the preparation of a medicament, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ukai et al. ("Ukai"). Ukai describes the preparation of a galanin composition (page 1284) which meets the limitations of the instant claims because galanin itself acts as an agonist on galanin receptors.

7. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaplan (WO 92/12997). Kaplan describes the preparation of a galanin composition (pages 7-8) which meets the limitations of the instant claims because galanin itself acts as an agonist on galanin receptors.

Serial Number: 09/230,463

4

Art Unit: 1647

8. Claims 1, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evans et al.

("Evans", WO 92/15681). Evans describes the preparation of a galanin composition (page 8)

which meets the limitations of the instant claims because galanin itself acts as an agonist on galanin receptors.

9. No claim is allowed.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gucker whose telephone number is (703) 308-6571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 0930 to 1800. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623. The fax phone number for this Group is currently (703) 308-4242, but Applicant should confirm this by phoning the Examiner before faxing.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

SG

Stephen Gucker

August 27, 2001

Gary L. Kunz
GARY L. KUNZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600